



National Spent Nuclear Fuel Program

Integrated Repository Receipts

***(The shipment of DOE SNF &
HLW)***

Corey L. Beebe



*Providing for safe,
efficient disposition of
DOE spent nuclear fuel*

Outline

- Background
- Status
- Objectives
- Path forward
- Conclusion



Providing for safe, efficient disposition of DOE spent nuclear fuel

Background

- EM/RW MOA requires “...a projected initial acceptance capacity and overall schedule for receipt of DOE SNF and/or HLW at RW facilities at least 120 months prior to initial acceptance date...”
- A joint effort between the Office of Integration and Disposition and the NSNFP involved a team of federal & contractor personnel representing sites, Yucca Mountain, Navy, EM, and RW participated.



Background (cont.)

- Sites presented baseline plans
 - Conclusion: room for improvement
 - Aligned with MGR receiving
 - Coordinated SNF & HLW ratios
 - Investigate interim storage capacities at sites
- Developed and proposed a shipping schedule for RW during February 2000.



Background (cont.)

- Schedule highlights
 - Minimize MGR lag storage and site interim storage
 - 160 waste package emplacement per year
 - Ship HLW and SNF to meet 5 to 1 ratio
 - Minimize the number of transportation casks
- Some changes included impacts to generation schedules.



Status

- Project Requirements Document (Draft)
- Analysis approach documented for HLW Steering Committee
- Independent testing of spreadsheet model



Status (cont.)

- Responded to site requests
 - ORP/RL (production and shipping cases)
 - SRS (HLW System Plan)
- RW input
 - Team effort with commercial fuel
 - Comments on proposed schedule



Status (cont.)

- Quality and configuration control
 - Online documentation and references
 - Version control
 - Spreadsheet protection
 - Backups and access
 - QA strategy



Objectives

- Develop a schedule for shipping DOE SNF & HLW to the MGR that is implementable by EM & RW; and concurred with by stakeholders.
- Provide interim storage strategies that have the capability to accommodate changes in MGR schedules, take advantage of potential site closures, and optimize storage, shipping, and production schedules.



Path Forward

- Sites develop shipping, production, and storage plans within established bounds. (Site directed stakeholder involvement)
- Understand and analyze impacts of changes.
 - Existing to proposed
 - Contingencies



Path Forward (cont.)

- Sites lead and conduct updates, with team from Office of Integration & Disposition to ensure consistency & make analysis tools available.
- Re-convene with entire group.
- Update site plans in accordance with integrated schedule.



Conclusion

- This is an immediate need for 2010 acceptance:
 - Baseline change process
 - Construction projects
 - Turn over to operations
 - Preparations for shipment



Conclusion (cont.)

- The current baselines can be improved.
- Site and HQ involvement is required to develop implementable baselines.

